



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/231,656 04/25/94 ROSE

D P1219041

EXAMINER

B3M1/0801

PHAM, C

JAMES W. PETERSON
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS
P.O. BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3

2307

DATE MAILED:

08/01/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 60 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474..
6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1-27 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

Serial Number: 08/231,656

-2-

Art Unit: 2307

Part III DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed on 9/13/94 has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same

person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

5. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bussey et al., "Service Architecture, Prototype Description, and Network Implications of a personalized information Grazing Service.", IEEE INFOCOM, 1990, pages 1049-1053 in view of M. F. Wyle, "A Wide Area Network Information filter.", Artificial Intelligence on Wall Street, 1991 Conference, Date 1991, Pages 10-15.

6. As to claim 1, Bussey et al. show the invention substantially as claimed, including a data processing 'DP' system, an information access system for automatically presenting users with items of interest, comprising: a computer system containing a database of information items to present to users [FIG. 1, database]; at least one access device for enabling users to communicate with computer system and access any information [FIG. 1, section 3.1, and 3.2]; means for storing a user profile for each user [col. 2, lines 29-31]; means for enabling the user to indicate that user's interest in each retrieved item [see section 2.2, Service Description]; and means for updating the user's profile in response to indications of interest by the user [FIG. 1, profile Update, col. 2, lines 39-41 and col. 3, lines 7-11].

Art Unit: 2307

Bussey et al. disclose the claimed invention except for ranking the likely degree of interest for each of the items in accordance with a user profile. M. F. Wyle teaches that it is known to rank the relevance and importance of stored and managed system for using high performance retrieval with user interest profiles [Abstract].

Both Bussey et al. and M. F. Wyle do not disclose presenting the items of information to an access device in order of ranking. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display/present the items of information to respond the users personalized interest with the Bussey et al. and Wyle's systems, since a modification would have improved of the on-line information system by identifying the relevant user's interest with an adaptive user's profile.

7. Claims 2-16 encompass the same scope of the invention as that depends on claim 1. The claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.

8. Claims 17-27 encompass the same scope of the invention as that claims 1-16. The claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2307

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

MacPhail, US Patent No. 5,107,419 "Method of assigning retention and deletion criteria to electronic documents stored in interactive information handling system." (395/600)

Gilchrist et al., US Patent No. 5,132,900 "Method and apparatus for limiting manipulation of documents within a multi-document relationship in a data processing system." (364/419)

C. F. Reynolds, "ON-LINE REVIEWS: a new Application of the HICOM conferencing System.", IEEE Colloq., 1989, pages 1-5.

Anselm Spoerri, "Visual Tools for Information Retrieval", IEEE Symposium, 1993, pages 160-186.

Andrew Jennings, "Customer Adaptive communication services.", IEEE, 1992, Pages 886-890.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cuan Pham whose telephone number is (703) 308-6684. The Fax phone number for this group are (703) 305-9564 or (703) 305-9565.

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

CP
July 12, 1995

Thomas G. Black
THOMAS G. BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2300